



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/798,580	03/10/2004	Arnold Blinn	MS#304543.01 (5101)	6335
38779	7590	04/24/2008 SENNIGER POWERS LLP (MSFT) ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE, 16TH FLOOR ST. LOUIS, MO 63102		
		EXAMINER SHAFFER HARRIMAN, DANT B		
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2134		
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/24/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspatents@senniger.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/798,580	Applicant(s) BLINN ET AL.
	Examiner DANT B. SHAIFER HARRIMAN	Art Unit 2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 March 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1 - 10 & 12, 13 & 15, 19, 20, 22, 23, 30, 32 - 38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1- 10 & 12, 13, & 15, 19, 20, 22, 23, 30, 32 - 38 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 10 March 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

- Claims 1, 12, 15, 22, 30, 32, 34, 35 are amended in the instant pending case.
- Claims 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 19, 20, 23, 33, 36, 37, 38 are original in the instant pending case.
- Claims 11, 14, 16, 17, 18, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 39, 30 are cancelled in the instant pending application.

Response to Arguments

- Applicants arguments filed 03/28/2008 have been fully considered and are found to be persuasive; however applicant's arguments are moot in view of new grounds of rejection. ***Applicants remarks will be addressed by the newly added reference, the added reference is Xia et al. (US PGPUB No. 2005/0005133 A1). Xia et al. teaches a user device or client that requests access to resource through a server, the user device or clients authorization to the requested resource is optional (Paragraph: 0036). For details please see the office action below.***

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim(s) 1 - 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venkataramappa (US 2003/0188193 A1) in view of Zhang et al. (US 7036142 B1) further in view of Xia et al. (US PGPUB NO. 2005/0005133 A1)

Both Venkataramappa and Zhang are references cited in the applicant's information Disclosure Statement.

Venkataramappa discloses a client that requests services from a first network server and a second network server and any subsequent network server in the network, Paragraph: 0054 & 0059 & 0060 & 0061. The client is authenticated by a first network server, the first network server sends a request to the KDC (i.e. central server of Blinn) server, Paragraph: 0055. The KDC is made up of a Kerberos authentication server and a TGS (ticket granting service), Paragraph: 0053. The KDC allows the user or client to sign on only once, without having to sign on multiple times, the TGT and SSO token allows the second server or other servers to recognize which client or user has been authenticated before, Paragraph: 0057 & 0058 & 0059, and will not request that the user sign on again when requesting service or content from other or different servers on the network, Paragraphs: 0054 & 0067.

Venkataramappa does not appear to explicitly disclose first and second servers are in different domains or storing first data on the client in response to the received first request, said first data identifying the first service wherein the authentication of the user by the first service is optional, also Venkataramappa doesn't

discloses allowing the user to access the first service without authenticating the user.

However, Zhang discloses single sign on users or subscribers to access both public and private domains when requesting content or service for the network server, Col 5, lines 30 - 51.

Further, However Xia discloses, storing first data on the client in response to the received first request, said first data identifying the first service wherein the authentication of the user by the first service is optional (Paragraph: 0036); also Xia, also discloses allowing the user to access the first service without authenticating the user(Paragraph: 0036).

Venkataramappa and Zhang and Xia are analogous art because they are from the "same field of endeavor," allow a user to be authenticated and access multiple servers through a "single sign on" protocol.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Venkataramappa and Zhang before him or her, to modify a client that requests services from a first network server and a second network server and any subsequent network server in the network, Paragraph: 0054 & 0059 & 0060 & 0061. The client is authenticated by a first network server, the first network server sends a request to the KDC (i.e. central server of Blinn) server, Paragraph: 0055. The KDC is made up of a authentication server and a TGS (ticket granting service), Paragraph: 0053. The KDC allows the user or

client to sign on only once, without having to sign on multiple times, the TGT and SSO token allows the server or servers to recognize which client or user has been authenticated before, Paragraph: 0057 & 0058 & 0059 and will not request that the user sign on again, Paragraph 0054 & 0067 of Venkataramappa to include the authentication to access multiple domains, Col 5, lines 30 - 51 of Zhang, further to include the optional user authentication by the first server of Xia.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to a "single sign on," once and allowed access to multiple servers in multiple domains without having to re- authenticate again, Col. 5, lines 30-67 & Col. 7, lines 38 – 67, please also see **KSR v. Teleflex**, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1740, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1396 (2007))

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Venkataramappa with Zhang, further combine Xia to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claim(s).

Claim(s) 35 - 40 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being obvious over Venkataramappa (US 2003/0188193 A 1) in view of Stanko (US PGPUB# 20050074126) further in view of Xia et al. (US PGPUB NO. 2005/0005133 A1)

Both Venkataramappa and Stanko are references cited in the applicant's information Disclosure Statement.

Venkataramappa discloses a client that requests services from a first network server and a second network server and any subsequent network server in the network, Paragraph: 0054 &

0059 & 0060 & 0061. The client is authenticated by a first network server, the first network server sends a request to the KDC (i.e. central server of Blinn) server, Paragraph: 0055. The KDC is made up of a Kerberos authentication server and a TGS (ticket granting service), Paragraph: 0053. The KDC allows the user or client to sign on only once, without having to sign on multiple times, the TGT and SSO token allows the second server or other servers to recognize which client or user has been authenticated before, Paragraph: 0057 & 0058 & 0059, and will not request that the user sign on again when requesting service or content from other or different servers on the network, Paragraphs: 0054 & 0067.

Venkataramappa does not appear to explicitly disclose a computer readable medium that executes a client that requests services from a first network server and a second network server and any subsequent network server in the network, the client is authenticated by a first network server, the first network server sends a request to the KDC (i.e. central server of Blinn) server which is made up of a Kerberos authentication server and a TGS (ticket granting service), the KDC allows the user or client to sign on only once, without having to sign on multiple times, the TGT and SSO token allows the server or servers to recognize which client or user has been authenticated before, and will not request that the user sign on again, further Venkataramappa doesn't disclose a response component for storing first data on the client in response to the received first request, said first data identifying the first service wherein the authentication of the user by the first service is optional.

However, Stanko discloses a computer readable medium that allows a user through a client machine to be authenticated by an authentication server for access to a secure server that will provide content to the client or users request, Paragraph: 0042 &

0078. The user will only have to be authenticated once by the authentication server, to be allowed access to other secured servers on the network, Paragraph: 0050. This is possible by the fact that a authentication ticket is stored on both a the client and the authentication server to which other secured servers have access to on the network, Paragraph: 0048 & 0049 & 0050.

Further, However Xia discloses, a response component for storing first data on the client in response to the received first request, said first data identifying the first service wherein the authentication of the user by the first service is optional (Paragraph: 0036);

Venkataramappa and Stanko and Xia are analogous art because they are from the "same field of endeavor," which is the field of authenticating a user or client once, with a proof of the authentication stored on the client and the content server and the authentication authority, which will allow the user or client subsequent access to plurality of other content servers on the network without having to be re-authenticated again.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Venkataramappa and Stanko before him or her, to modify a client that requests services from a first network server and a second network server and any subsequent network server in the network, Paragraph: 0054 & 0059 & 0060 & 0061. The client is authenticated by a first network server, the first network server sends a request to the KDC (i.e. central server of Blinn) server, Paragraph: 0055. The KDC is made up of a Kerberos authentication server and a TGS (ticket granting service), Paragraph: 0053. The KDC allows the

user or client to sign on only once, without having to sign on multiple times, the TGT and SSO token allows the second server or other servers to recognize which client or user has been authenticated before, Paragraph: 0057 & 0058 & 0059, and will not request that the user sign on again when requesting service or content from other or different servers on the network, Paragraphs: 0054 & 0067 of Venkataramappa to include a computer readable medium that allows a user through a client machine to be authenticated by an authentication server for access to a secure server that will provide content to the client or users request, Paragraph: 0042 & 0078. The user will only have to be authenticated once by the authentication server, to be allowed access to other secured servers on the network, Paragraph: 0050. This is possible by the fact that a authentication ticket is stored on both the client and the authentication server, Paragraph: 0048 & 0049 & 0050 of Stanko, further to include the optional user authentication by the first server of Xia.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been allowing a user or client to access a vast array of information or content from a variety of sources in a network without having to authenticate numerous times when the user wants to request another service from a different content or service provider on the network, Paragraphs: Background: 0002 – 0013, also please see **KSR v. Teleflex**, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1740, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1396 (2007))

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Stanko with Venkataramappa and further combined with Xia to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claim(s).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DANT B. SHAIFER HARRIMAN whose telephone number is (571)272-7910. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday: 8:00am - 5:30pm Alt.Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Zand can be reached on (571) 272-3811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

04/16/2008

/Dant B Shaifer - Harriman /
Examiner, Art Unit 2134

/Kambiz Zand/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2134